Dear Dick, 6/10/75

It went very well in court today in the suit vs DJ and FBI for the still-suppressed King assassination evidence but the government remains able to stall by the devices of which you know. They want to brief an issue of alleged law. It will take time but I'll make them dance for it. However, their main objective is to stall and delay in all ways possible.

We will be back in court on this July 1. I certainly hope to be caught up on the draft by then.

But as there have been there are take-taking in-court needs. I was able to anticipate out next one rather well. However, I was not able to get it to Jim in time for him to know the fact before the hearing today. So it is the (incomplete) draft of an affidavit that will be in point.

It is going our way in court but there has been no more new evidence of any value.

They'll not give any voluntarily. They dare now. So, because it is going up in particular, we are building the record. Today we blew minds at the same time and on a major issue burned the judge around.

I think the judge is as fascinated and amazed by our constant production of relevant documents as the AUSA is unhappy about them and us. Today there was an FBI affidavit, not first hand, about the search of files, restricted to a minor fraction as described as those of the FBI's central headquarters. I had ready 8 66 consecutive items described by the FBI in the past from those files. In not one can you detect the contents, one titled "Oswald" had at one point 200 documents all on the radical right only and almost all we were titled "Oswald-Russia-Cuba-Internal Security."

And when they complained about the burdensomeness of all of this our response was that they make it this way on purpose. Example: I asked the FBI for a publicity press release of 1966. I never could get it. Last year I asked Jim to ask Attorney Gen for it. He was told if I want a press release to file for it under FOIA. I did, I got it and as we told the court, their statistics and they hour computations went up accordingly.

There were other similar instances but no need to go into them. In the end the judge was lecturing the AUSA on the FBI's need to stop stonewalling, face its past and move ahead, cleansed. So the court knows but is limited it what it can done.

What was probably funniest was their claim they had to rank the names of people on the reports they did give to protect them from harrassment. The invoked the privacy provisions for their people. We responded not only by saying all the people were well known but with a "apartment rather than FBI letter I got in Memphis and had along giving their names and the fact that they had been subpoenaed and their names were all very public.

How factual can stonewallers get? The claimed an exemption that relates to documents only and personnel files only and then when these are "solely" personnel files to rank the names of the various people who signed scientific tests. It also gives you an idea of what we are up against in stalling tricks.

On others matters for which I'll not take time I've asked Jim to file several motions I think in another forum will help Harvey and others who seek their own files. If your sycophant judge rules against you there, I urge you not to appeal but to refile in D.C. using Jim as co-counsel because we have already established new precedents that will help you. We will yet exercise discovery on the CIA. If you do get thrown out give yourself a little time to exhaust your remedies with a couple of other candidates I have for you. If you think this will happen, if I may offer advice, start these things now and they will have run their course by the time you might need them.

Best,